



## Appendix C – Correspondence

Appendix C includes comments received and the associated response.

 <p><b>Montana Department of ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</b></p> <p>Brian Schweitzer, Governor</p> <p>P.O. Box 200901 • Helena, MT 59620-0901 • (406) 444-2544 • www.deq.mt.gov</p>	<p><u>Comment Number</u></p>
<p>March 22, 2006</p> <p>Scott Brown U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region VIII, Montana Office 10 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3200 Helena, MT 59626</p> <p><b>SUBJECT: Comments on the draft Second Five-Year Review Report, East Helena Superfund Site, Montana</b></p> <p>Dear Mr. Brown:</p> <p>DEQ has reviewed the above-referenced report and has the following general and specific comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Global: The Executive Summary uses the term “Superfund Site”; the Introduction uses the terms “NPL Site” (page 7) and the “East Helena Site” (page 8); the Background section uses the term “East Helena Smelter Superfund Site”, “Superfund Site”, “Smelter Site” (page 10), and the “Site” (page 13). Some of these terms are defined after their first use but their subsequent use is inconsistent and sometimes confusing. It seems that only two terms are needed (Superfund Site and Smelter Site).</li> <li>2. Executive Summary, page 1, last ¶ (also page 9, third ¶, and Appendix A, page 1, last ¶): Change to, “EPA divided responsibilities for the OU’s between...”.</li> <li>3. Page 6, Five-Year Review Summary Form, Other Comments, last sentence: Please give justification why no changes are recommended to the ROD prescribed standards.</li> <li>4. Page 10, Event table, 2/17/05 entry: Please correct typographical error to “Prickly Pear Creek.”</li> <li>5. Page 10, Section III, first ¶, first sentence: The Superfund Site is not just located “in the community of East Helena, Lewis and Clark County” but includes the surrounding area, some of which is in Jefferson County.</li> <li>6. Page 13, first, second and third paragraphs: Please clarify that the “Site” referenced here is the smelter site (or plant site) and not the Superfund site. In the third paragraph, first sentence, please change to “The Smelter Site includes Prickly Pear Creek...”.</li> </ol> <p>Enforcement Division • Permitting &amp; Compliance Division • Planning, Prevention &amp; Assistance Division • Remediation Division</p>	<p>C-1.1</p> <p>C-1.2</p> <p>C-1.3</p> <p>C-1.4</p> <p>C-1.5</p> <p>C-1.6</p>

<p>Mr. Scott Brown March 22, 2006 Page 2 of 2</p>	<p><u>Comment Number</u></p>
<p>7. Page 13, third ¶, second to last sentence and page 15, first ¶, fourth full sentence contain contradictory statements on the distance from East Helena to Lake Helena.</p>	<p>C-1.7</p>
<p>8. Page 15, Site Health Risks: The list of reports should also include the Human Health Risk Assessment, (Klienfelder, 1995) and the Risk Assessment Review memorandum (ISSI, 1999).</p>	<p>C-1.8</p>
<p>9. Page 24, location of documents: The phone number for the Lewis and Clark County Lead Education and Abatement Office should be (406) 227-8451.</p>	<p>C-1.9</p>
<p>10. Page 26, Question B discussion: The November 1989 Process Ponds ROD lists federal MCLs as relevant and appropriate, yet the only reference in the five year review of the current MCL for arsenic of 10 µg/l is a footnote in Table VII-2 (page27). The justifications for the waiver in 1989 were that the substitute standard of 20 µg/L was achievable, was below the federal MCL of 50 µg/l, and represented the upper range of water quality data for Prickly Pear Creek. The MCL has been lowered to 10 µg/L, calling into question the protectiveness of the 20 µg/l standard, and water quality from Prickly Pear Creek has slightly improved (based on data gathered for the 2005 Ecological Risk Assessment). The five year review should discuss the protectiveness of the 20 µg/L standard, acknowledge and discuss the current MCL, and discuss the impact of the Lower Lake discharge on the receiving stream.</p>	<p>C-1.10</p>
<p>11. Page 27, Table VII-2: Include the current MCLs in the table for reference.</p>	<p>C-1.11</p>
<p>12. Page 28, first ¶, last sentence: Change reference to "Groundwater OU2".</p>	<p>C-1.12</p>
<p>13. Appendix A, page 6, Surface Soils discussions and tables: Please update the information to include the 2004 Year End Report (Randall Contracting, June 2005). Also, please include a discussion of the IEUBK Lead model for East Helena children.</p>	<p>C-1.13</p>
<p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions or concerns about this letter, feel free to contact me.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>  <p>Daryl Reed State Project Officer Federal Superfund Section</p> <p>cc: Sandi Olsen Vic Andersen Mary Capdeville</p>	

**Table A-C. Comment and Response**

Comment Number	Response
C-1.1	This language has been changed throughout the document. However, 'Superfund Site' and 'NPL Site' are used interchangeably.
C-1.2	This language has been changed throughout the document.
C-1.3	<p>The following discussion has been added (see page 6) "The prescribed standards for water quality stated in the 1989 Record of Decision were revised downward from the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Regulations (ARARs) based on achievability due to background conditions, technical impracticability, and cost. Since 1989, the ARARs for some of the chemicals of concern have decreased. As noted in this review and further emphasized by the State of Montana Department of Environmental Quality, the federal MCL for Arsenic has recently been decreased to 10 ug/L and this 'calls into question the protectiveness of the 20 ug/L prescribed standard' with regard to Lower Lake, which is hydrologically connected to Prickly Pear Creek.</p> <p>However, the ROD prescribed standards remain consistent with the remedial action objectives. The adequacy of the established remedial action objectives, under Superfund actions, is now superseded by the RCRA Facility Investigations. Lower Lake and Prickly Pear Creek are regulated by the RCRA Facility Investigations, and under RCRA, Lower Lake's connection to Prickly Pear Creek and technical practicability's are currently under investigation; therefore, no changes are recommended to the prescribed standards at this time."</p>
C-1.4	This typographical error has been corrected.
C-1.5	This language has been changed to state "The East Helena Superfund Site includes portions of the community of East Helena, Lewis and Clark County, and Jefferson County, Montana (see Figure III-1, General Superfund Site Location in Lewis and Clark and Jefferson Counties, Montana)."
C-1.6	This language has been changed.
C-1.7	This language has been changed to state 'approximately 10 miles to the north'.
C-1.8	The noted reports have been added.
C-1.9	The phone number has been changed.
C-1.10	The following discussion has been added (see page 27, paragraph 2). "Copper and Arsenic levels remain above the 1989 ROD prescribed standards, but Arsenic levels are below the current federal and state ARARs for acute aquatic life. In addition to acute aquatic life

	standards, the 1989 ROD noted that the prescribed standards were below the federal MCL of 50 ug/L. This federal MCL has recently been revised to 10 ug/L; because of this, the State of Montana Department of Environmental Quality notes that this “calls into question the protectiveness of the 20 ug/L standard” (see Appendix C – Correspondence). At this time, because the prescribed standards remain consistent with the overarching remedial action objective of ‘eliminating the primary source of groundwater contamination’, and in light of ongoing RCRA Facility Investigations, no change to the prescribed standards is recommended at this time.”
C-1.11	See response to C-1.10. MCLs were not added to Table VII-2.
C-1.12	This language has been changed.
C-1.13	Information from the 2004 Year End Report has been included. A discussion of the IEUBK has been added (see page 7, paragraph 2).